

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Please replace sheet 3 with the attached replacement sheet 3. This replacement sheet amends figure 4 by removing reference numeral 400.

REMARKS

The Office action mailed March 13, 2006, allows claims 53, 54, 57, and 58, rejects claims 22, 24, 25, 27-33, and 55, and objects to the drawings and specification. The applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in light of the amendments and remarks presented in this reply.

I. Response to drawing objection

The action objects to the drawings. This reply responds to the objection by amending the drawings and specification.

II. Response to § 102 rejection

Claims 22, 24, 25, and 27-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0127414 ("Andersson"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

As amended, claim 22 comprises a storage node located within a well region where the storage node is doped to a first conductivity type and a portion of a semiconductor well surrounding the storage node is doped to a second conductivity type. The prior art cited in the action does not teach or suggest at least this feature of claim 22.

The dependent claims are not anticipated by the cited prior art at least because they depend from an allowable base claim.

III. Response to § 112 rejection and request for interview

Claim 55 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Figure 4 shows a storage region located in a first well region and a photosensor located within a second n-well region. Based on this figure, one of

ordinary skill would have concluded that the inventor had possession of the invention of claim 55.

If the examiner continues to feel that this claim fails the written description requirement, the applicants request the examiner to telephone the undersigned to discuss the matter before issuing another Office action.

IV. Response to specification objection and request for interview

The action objects to the specification as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the text "said separate semiconductor well" in claim 25. This reply responds to this objection by amending the claims. If the examiner continues to feel that the specification fails to provide proper antecedent basis, the applicants request the examiner to telephone the undersigned to discuss the matter before issuing another Office action.

V. Conclusion

In view of the above amendment, the applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance. If there are any formal matters remaining after this reply, the applicants respectfully request the examiner to telephone the undersigned. If there are any additional fees associated with the filing of this reply, please charge them to deposit account no. 04-1073.

Application No. 10/623,533
Reply to Office Action of March 13, 2006

Docket No.: M4065.0841/P841-A

Dated:

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Thomas J. D'Amico

Registration No.: 28,371

E. F. C. Gain Jr.

Registration No.: 55,917

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &
OSHINSKY LLP

2101 L Street NW

Washington, DC 20037-1526

(202) 785-9700

Attorneys for Applicants